UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,437	04/18/2001	Michael P. Etgen	RSW9-2001-0006-US1	3954

7590   05/05/2004

Gregory S. Bernabeo, Esq.
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA   19107-2950

EXAMINER
LEWIS, ADAM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	5

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 March 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,6,8,9,11 and 14-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 14-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2.   Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 14-31 are pending in this application. Amendment A amended claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 15, 16, 18, 21-24, cancelled claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, and 13, and added claims 25-31.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 16 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 16 recites the limitation of filling said display area of said certain size in reaction to the user resizing the slider. This limitation is merely a rewording of the last portion of independent claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paal et al. ("Paal," US# 5,263,134) in view of.Warnock et al. ("Warnock," #US 5,634,064).

As per independent claim 21, Paal teaches a system for displaying a user-selected portion of an image, said system comprising:

means for displaying a first slider, said first slider being variable in size according to user input (Paal, col. 12, lines 4-16);

means for providing a display area (Paal, Figs. 5-6);

means for resizing said first slider (Paal, col. 12, lines 4-16); and

means for displaying any selected portion of said image in said display area to fill said display area, a scope of said portion of said image corresponding to a size of said first slider as resized (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 17-23).

Paal fails to teach the limitations of means for providing a display area of a certain size, and fill said display area of said certain size.

Warnock teaches performing both a "pan" and "zoom" function by moving the desired portion of the image into an article viewing area of a window and then increasing the size of the portion of the article to make it more readable (Warnock, Figs. 4a-c; col. 8, lines 61-65). It would have been obvious to include the ability to increase the size of the portion of the image as in Warnock into the image viewing system of Paal because it would make the image more readable and/or easier to view.

Independent claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, Paal further teaches the system of claim 21, further comprising:

means for displaying a second slider, said second slider cooperating with said first slider to define said portion of said image, said first slider being variable in size according to user input (Paal, Figs. 5-6);

wherein said portion of said image is defined responsive to a user's resizing of said first slider or said second slider (Paal, Figs. 5-6). In the case of Paal, the pairs of horizontal lines and vertical lines bounding the "view area" of the "scroll palette" define the two different sliders.

Dependent claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 22, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5.   Claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 15, 16, 18-20, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paal in view of Rowe et al. ("Rowe," US# 5,819,301) and Warnock.

As per independent claim 1, Paal teaches a method for displaying a user-selected portion of representation of an image, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) displaying a representation of said image via a graphical user interface (Paal, col. 4, lines 45-46);

(b) providing a display area via the graphical user interface, said display area being provided adjacent said image (Paal, col. 5, lines 41-50);

(c) displaying a slider that is variable in size according to user input, said slider being displayed superimposed over a representation of said image to define a corresponding first portion of said image within a boundary of said slider (Paal, col. 12, lines 4-16);

(d) displaying said first portion of said image in said display area, said first portion of said image being enlarged relative to said image (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 17-23);

(e) accepting user input to resize said slider, the user input being accepted responsive to a user's manipulation of an input device (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 17-23);

(f) displaying said slider as resized, said resized slider being displayed superimposed over said representation of image to define a corresponding second portion of said image within said boundary of said slider (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 17-23); and

(g) displaying a said second portion of said image in said display area, said portion of said image being enlarged relative to said image (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 17-23).Paal fails to teach the limitations of displaying the actual image and the portion of the image being enlarged to fill the display area of a certain size. However, Rowe teaches a thumbnails window that displays page icons, each of which represents a separate page in the viewed portable electronic document (Rowe, col. 12, lines 26-36). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to replace the representation of the image of Paal with the actual thumbnail image of Rowe because it would give the user a better sense of what portion of the image the user was highlighting with the sliders.

The invention of Paal and Rowe fails to teach the limitation of enlarging the portion of said image to fill said display area of said certain size. Warnock teaches performing both a "pan" and "zoom" function by moving the desired portion of the image into an article viewing area of a window and then increasing the size of the portion of the article to make it more readable (Warnock, Figs. 4a-c; col. 8, lines 61-65). It would have been obvious to include the ability to increase the size of the portion of the image

as in Warnock into the image viewing system of Paal and Rowe because it would make the image more readable and/or easier to view.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Paal further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said user's manipulation of said input device of step (c) comprises a click-and-drag technique (Paal, col. 12, lines 19-23).

Independent claim 15 and dependent claim 19 are similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Paal further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said slider is translatable over said image (Paal, Fig. 5; col. 10, lines 2-26).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Paal further teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

(h) displaying a second slider, said second slider being superimposed over said image and cooperating with said slider to define said first and second portions of said image at an intersection of said second slider and said slider, said second slider being variable in size according to user input (Paal, Figs. 5-6);

wherein said second portion of said image is defined responsive to said user's resizing of said slider or said second slider (Paal, Figs. 5-6). In the case of Paal, the pairs of horizontal lines and vertical lines bounding the "view area" of the "scroll palette" define the two different sliders.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 11, Paal further teaches the method of claim 11, wherein said slider is translatable relative to said image along only axis (Paal, col. 11, lines 52-68 and col. 12, lines 1-3).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, Paal further teaches the method of claim 25, wherein said slider is resizable only along said axis (Paal, col. 11, lines 52-68 and col. 12, lines 1-3).

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 26, Paal further teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said second slider is translatable relative to said image along only a second axis orthogonal to said axis, and wherein said second slider is resizable along only said second axis (Paal, col. 11, lines 52-68 and col. 12, lines 1-3).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 11, Paal further teaches the method of claim 11, wherein said second slider is translatable relative to said image along only a second axis orthogonal to said axis (Paal, col. 11, lines 52-68 and col. 12, lines 1-3).

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, Paal further teaches the method of claim 27, wherein said second slider is resizable along only said second axis (Paal, col. 11, lines 52-68 and col. 12, lines 1-3).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Warnock teaches the graphical user interface of claim 15, wherein resizing of said slider causes the portion of the data file displayed in the display area to change, the changed portion filling said display area of said certain size (Warnock, col. 8, lines 61-65), as cited in the rejection of claim 15.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 15, Paal further teaches the graphical user interface of claim 15, wherein said slider is translatable relative to said image along only one axis (Paal, col. 11, lines 52-68 and col. 12, lines 1-3).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 29, Paal further teaches the graphical user interface of claim 15, wherein said slider is translatable relative to said image along only one axis (Paal, col. 11, lines 52-68 and col. 12, lines 1-3).

As per independent claim 18, Paal teaches a method for displaying user-selected portion of an image, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) displaying a representation of said image via a graphical user interface (Paal, col. 4, lines 45-46);

(b) displaying a first slider that is variable in size according to user input, at least a portion of said first slider being superimposed over said representation of image (Paal, col. 12, lines 4-16);

(c) displaying a second slider that is variable in size according to user input, at least a portion of said second slider being superimposed over said representation of image and intersecting said first slider, said second slider cooperating with said first slider to define a first portion of said image at an intersection of said first slider and said second slider (Paal, Figs. 5-6);

(d) accepting user input to resize said first slider or said second slider and thereby define a second portion of said image at their intersection (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 17-23); and

(e) displaying in a display, area of a certain size said second portion of said image, said second portion of said image (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 17-23).

Paal fails to teach the limitations of displaying the actual image and the portion of the image being enlarged to fill the display area of a certain size. However, Rowe teaches a thumbnails window that displays page icons, each of which represents a separate page in the viewed portable electronic document (Rowe, col. 12, lines 26-36). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to replace the representation of the image of Paal with the actual thumbnail image of Rowe because it would give the user a better sense of what portion of the image the user was highlighting with the sliders.

The invention of Paal and Rowe fails to teach the limitation of enlarging the portion of said image to fill said display area of said certain size. Warnock teaches performing both a "pan" and "zoom" function by moving the desired portion of the image into an article viewing area of a window and then increasing the size of the portion of the article to make it more readable (Warnock, Figs. 4a-c; col. 8, lines 61-65). It would have been obvious to include the ability to increase the size of the portion of the image as in Warnock into the image viewing system of Paal and Rowe because it would make the image more readable and/or easier to view.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, Paal teaches the method of claim 18, wherein said user input is provided by a click-and-drag technique (Paal, col. 12, lines 19-23).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 18, Paal teaches the method of claim 18, wherein said first portion or said second portion of said image is displayed adjacent said image (Paal, col. 5, lines 41-50).

6.   Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paal, Rowe, and Warnock as applied to claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 15, 16, 18-20, and 25-31 above, and further in view of Moran et al. ("Moran," US# 5,717,869).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, the invention of Paar, Rowe, and Warnock fails to teach the method of claim 1; wherein a visual momentum technique is used to relate said second portion of said image to said image. Moran teaches displaying a visual relationship between the overview of a file area and the focused file area (Moran, Fig. 5; col. 20, lines 33-52). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use visual relationship of Moran in the data display system of Paar, Rowe, and Warnock because it would provide a more clear correlation between the small image and the large image.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Moran further teaches the method of claim 8, wherein said visual momentum technique comprises displaying a pair of lines extending from said second portion of said image to said image (Moran, Fig. 5; col. 20, lines 33-52).

7.   Claims 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paal, Rowe, and Warnock as applied to claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 15, 16, 18-20, and 25-31 above, and further in view of Perry ("Perry," US# 5,553,225).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, the invention of Paal, Rowe, and Warnock fails to teach the method of claim 1, wherein said slider comprises a scroll box of a scroll bar. However, Perry teaches an input functionality by enabling the user to directly change the slider's length, thereby changing the display scale (Figs. 2 and 4-6; col. 4, lines 30-50). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the variable size slider bar of Perry in the slider system of Paal, Rowe, and Warnock because it would give the user a more visually familiar system, thereby making the system more user-friendly.

Dependent claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M. Lewis whose telephone number is 703-305-0720. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00-4:30, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

al

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100